

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated January 2, 2004 in which the Examiner stated that claims 1-10 are allowed and rejected claims 11-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 11 claims an anti-reflection film containing a low-refractive-index layer, having a refractive index of 1.30 to 1.55, which comprises from 50 to 95% by weight of short fibrous inorganic fine particles, and from 5 to 50% by weight of a polymer. There are micro voids formed among the short fibrous inorganic fine particles.

Through the structure of the claimed invention having short fibrous inorganic fine particles, as claimed in claim 11, the claimed invention provides an anti-reflection film having a low-refractive-index layer which causes no surface defects or pointing defects. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 11.

Claims 11-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yasuda et al.* (WO98/45734, corresponding to EP1022587).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C § 103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action and for reasons which are set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Yasuda et al. appears to disclose in Figure 3 a schematic cross-sectional view of a low refractive index layer. The upper surface of the low refractive index layer of Figure 3 is the surface of the anti-reflection film. A display device or a lens is placed below the layer of Figure 3. As shown in Figure 3, the low refractive index layer (1) is porous. In the low refractive index layer (1), the inorganic fine particles (11)

having a mean particle size of 0.5 to 200 nm are piled up (in Figure 3, three particles are piled up). Between the inorganic fine particles (11), micro voids (12) are formed. The low refractive index layer (1) further contains polymer (13) in an amount of 5 to 50 wt.%. The polymer (13) combines the particles (11), but does not fill the micro voids (12). As shown in Figure 1, the micro voids (12) are preferably not opened by enclosed with the polymer (13) and the inorganic fine particles (11). The low refractive index layer has a refractive index of 1.20 to 1.55, preferably 1.30 to 1.55, more preferably 1.30 to 1.50, further preferably 1.35 to 1.45. (paragraphs 0097-0099)

Thus, *Yasuda et al.* merely discloses a low refractive index layer having inorganic fine particles. Nothing in *Yasuda et al.* shows, teaches or suggests short **fibrous** inorganic fine particles as claimed in claim 11. Rather, *Yasuda et al.* merely discloses inorganic fine particles.

Applicants respectfully bring the Examiner's attention to Table 3 on page 165 and Table 4 on page 177 - excerpts as shown below which demonstrate the unexpected results of using short fibrous inorganic fine particles:

	Inorganic particles	Shape of inorganic particles	Point defect (number/m ²)
Example 2-2	SNOWTEX PS-M (trade name, Nissan Chemical Industries, Ltd.)	Short fibrous (Peal-like)	0
Example 2-3	MA-ST-UP (trade name, Nissan Chemical Industries, Ltd.)	Short-fibrous (Chain-state)	0
Example 2-5	FS-10P (trade name, Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha, Ltd.)	Short fibrous (Needle)	0
Comparative Example 2-3	Spherical fine silica particles (Nissan Chemical Industries, Ltd.)	Spherical	155

Since nothing in *Yasuda et al.* shows, teaches or suggests short **fibrous** inorganic fine particles as claimed in claim 11, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 12-24 depend from claim 11 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-24 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Yasuda et al.* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 12-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

New claim 41 has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 41 is also in condition for allowance.

As indicated above, a typographical error has been corrected in claim 5. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability and does not narrow the literal scope of the claims.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with the paper, please charge our
Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: March 30, 2004

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ellen Marcie Emas', written over a horizontal line.

Ellen Marcie Emas
Registration No. 32,131

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620